



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,659	12/11/2003	Jeffery S. Chase	RSW9-2003-0246US1 (7161-1)	8866

7590 04/06/2006

Steven M. Greenberg, Esquire
Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.
Suite 2040
200 East Las Olas Boulevard
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

EXAMINER

PATEL, HETUL B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2186

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/733,659

Applicant(s)

CHASE ET AL.

Examiner

Hetul Patel

Art Unit

2186

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the communication filed on March 13, 2006. Claims 1-16 are again presented for examination.
2. Applicant's arguments filed on March 13, 2006 have been fully considered but deemed to be moot in view of new ground rejection.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The examiner requests, in response to this Office action, any reference(s) known to qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. sections 102 or 103 with respect to the invention as defined by the independent and dependent claims. That is, any prior art (including any products for sale) similar to the claimed invention that could reasonably be used in a 102 or 103 rejection. This request does not require applicant to perform a search. This request is not intended to interfere with or go beyond that required under 37 C.F.R. 1 .56 or 1 .105.

The request may be fulfilled by asking the attorney(s) of record handling prosecution and the inventor(s)/assignee for references qualifying as prior art. A simple statement that the query has been made and no prior art found is sufficient to fulfill the request. Otherwise, the fee and certification requirements of 37 CFR section 1 .97 are waived for those documents submitted in reply to this request. This waiver extends only to those documents within the scope of this request that are included in the application's first complete communication responding to this requirement. Any

Art Unit: 2186

supplemental replies subsequent to the first communication responding to this request and any information disclosures beyond the scope of this are subject to the fee and certification requirements of 37 CFR section 1.97.

In the event prior art documentation is submitted, a discussion of relevant passages, figs, etc. with respect to the claims is requested. The examiner is looking for specific references to 102/103 prior art that identify independent and dependent claim limitations. Since applicant is most knowledgeable of the present invention and submitted art, his/her discussion of the reference(s) with respect to the instant claims is essential. **A response to this inquiry is greatly appreciated.**

The examiner also requests, in response to this Office action, support be shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line number(s), in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the examiner in prosecuting the application.

Specification

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The title should be more specific to differentiate the invention from similar inventions in the patent literature. The following aspect(s) of the invention should be mentioned in the title so that the title is more descriptive:

“computing Zipf alpha coefficient for current cache size, trace footprint and cache hit rate, and then, computing the optimal cache size based on the selected hit rate”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 4-6, 11 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the content of the web page

<http://polygraph.ircache.net/Workloads/PolyMix-2/> posted on 05/29/2001, hereinafter, WEB.

As per claim 1, WEB discloses results of the workload “polymix-2” with a simple diagram showing a four-day trace of proxy load. WEB further discloses a table (on page 4 of 8) with different hit ratios (i.e. hit rates) determined in response to (different) given cache size(s) and the trace (i.e. in “Unif” column). WEB also computes the Zipf alpha coefficient for (different) given cache size(s), trace footprint and hit rate (i.e. “Zipf(0.2)”, “Zipf(0.4)” and “Zipf(0.6)” columns). The steps of selecting an optimal hit rate and computing an optimal cache size are inherent in the WEB disclosure because from the table, for any given/selected “optimal” hit rate/ratio, the optimal cache size is calculated as shown in the “cache size” column. For example, if the selected hit rate/ratio is 8.5, then the optimal cache size for that selected hit rate is 10.

As per claim 4, WEB teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, WEB teaches that said determining step comprises parsing a log of server activity (i.e. recording how many hits for a given amount of time and requests) to identify said hit rate (e.g. see table on page 4 of 8).

As per claims 5 and 6, WEB teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, WEB teaches that said identifying step comprises the step of identifying a current cache size (i.e. the cache size column in the table on page 4 of 8) and a contemporaneously experienced trace footprint (i.e. trace value) for a single content delivery server (i.e. for any one specific robot or server) and for a cluster of servers (i.e. for each robot or server) (e.g. see under "6.1 Allocation scheme" title on page 6 of 8).

As per claims 11 and 14-16, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 4-6, respectively. Claims 11 and 14-16 are also rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 1 and 4-6, respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 2, 7-8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WEB.

As per claim 2, WEB teaches the claimed invention as described above, but WEB does not clearly disclose about reconfiguring the cache memory allocation based upon said optimal cache size. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the current invention was made to reconfigure the cache memory allocation based upon said optimal cache size to achieve the desired/selected hit rate.

As per claim 7-8, WEB teaches the method for first computing Zipf alpha coefficient for current cache size, trace footprint and cache hit rate, and then, computing the optimal cache size based on the selected hit rate as described above in the rejection of claim 1, but does not clearly disclose about having a processor for computing Zipf alpha coefficient, a processor for computing optimal cache size and a sever log storing statistics. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the current invention was made to implement this method/model steps taught by WEB into a system and connect it via a communicative link as claimed so the system can be used to calculate the optimum cache size for one or more server(s) without running the software simulation.

As per claim 12, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 2. Claim 12 is also rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 2.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 3, 9-10 and 13 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion


8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hetul Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-4184. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on 571-272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HBP
HBP


MATTHEW KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100